

# **EXHIBIT 1**

# **FILED UNDER SEAL**



1           **RESPONSE TO TOPIC NO. 5:**

2           Sonos objects that this topic is overly broad and burdensome because Google (not Sonos)  
 3 is the party most equipped to answer what information was “gleaned from Sonos” as a result of  
 4 Sonos’s collaborations with Google, and Google is well aware of the knowledge and information  
 5 that it gleaned from Sonos. Sonos further objects that “collaborations” as used herein is vague and  
 6 ambiguous in that “collaborations” could be used to apply generally to a range of different  
 7 activities, especially as the topic is not limited by time. Sonos will interpret “collaborations” as  
 8 referring to the collaboration between the parties to develop an application that would allow  
 9 Google’s music service to play directly to the Sonos music system. Subject to and without  
 10 waiving these objections, Sonos will produce one or more witnesses who, collectively, are  
 11 reasonably prepared to provide non-privileged testimony regarding such collaborations with  
 12 Google.

13           **TOPIC NO. 6:**

14           The agreements governing Sonos’s collaborations with Google, including but not limited  
 15 to the Content Integration Agreement, Sonos’s understanding of the scope of the [REDACTED]  
 16 [REDACTED] described in Section 3.4 of the Content Integration Agreement, Sonos’s  
 17 understanding of whether functionality developed or information exchanged as part of the parties’  
 18 collaboration is covered by the Content Integration Agreement, and an Identification of persons  
 19 most knowledgeable about this Topic.

20           **RESPONSE TO TOPIC NO. 6:**

21           Sonos objects to this topic as vague and ambiguous in that “Content Integration  
 22 Agreement” is not defined. Sonos further objects that “collaborations” as used herein is vague and  
 23 ambiguous in that “collaborations” could be used to apply generally to a range of different  
 24 activities. Sonos will interpret “collaborations” as referring to the collaboration between the  
 25 parties to develop an application that would allow Google’s music service to play directly to the  
 26 Sonos music system. Sonos also objects to this topic to the extent that it seeks information that is  
 27 protected by the attorney client privilege or work product doctrine. Sonos will not make available  
 28

1 any witness to provide testimony on privileged information. Sonos further objects to this topic as  
 2 improper to the extent it seeks legal opinions insofar as contract interpretation is question of law.

3 For the foregoing reasons, Sonos will not provide a witness on this topic.

4 **TOPIC NO. 7:**

5 Any attempt by Sonos to license, agreements for licensing, or payments or royalties  
 6 received for licensing the Patents-in-Suit, the Related Patents, and/or the subject matter disclosed  
 7 in the Patents-in-Suit or Related Patents and an Identification of persons most knowledgeable  
 8 about this Topic.

9 **RESPONSE TO TOPIC NO. 7:**

10 Sonos objects that this topic is vague and ambiguous because “Related Patents” is not  
 11 defined. Sonos will limit its response to the Patents-in-Suit. Sonos further objects that this topic is  
 12 overly broad and unduly burdensome insofar as it seeks licensing, payments, and royalty  
 13 information for the “subject matter disclosed in the Patents-in-Suit.” As written, the topic is broad  
 14 enough to encompass licenses and agreements that have nothing whatsoever to do with the claims  
 15 or issues in the case. Sonos will provide a witness who is reasonably prepared to testify about any  
 16 licensing agreements, payments, and royalties received for licensing the Patents-in-Suit. Sonos  
 17 also objects to this topic to the extent that it seeks information that is protected by the attorney  
 18 client privilege or work product doctrine. Sonos will not make available any witness to provide  
 19 testimony on privileged information.

20 Subject to and without waiving of these objections, Sonos will produce one or more  
 21 witnesses who, collectively, are reasonably prepared to provide non-privileged testimony  
 22 regarding the licensing agreements, payments, and royalties received for licensing the Patents-in-  
 23 Suit.

24 **TOPIC NO. 8:**

25 The factual bases for Sonos’s assertion that it is entitled to lost profits, including but not  
 26 limited to demand for the Allegedly Covered Products, any allegation that there is an absence of  
 27 any acceptable non-infringing alternatives, Sonos’s manufacturing and marketing capability to  
 28 exploit the demand of any Sonos Allegedly Covered Product, and the amount of profit Sonos

1 contends it would have made but for the alleged infringement by Google, and an Identification of  
 2 persons most knowledgeable about this Topic.

3 **RESPONSE TO TOPIC NO. 8:**

4 Sonos objects to this topic insofar as it seeks information that is protected by the attorney  
 5 client privilege or work product doctrine. Sonos will not make available any witness to provide  
 6 testimony on privileged information.

7 Sonos also objects to Google's definition of "Allegedly Covered Product." As explained  
 8 in the Definitions section above, Sonos will limit "Allegedly Covered Product" to mean any past  
 9 or present Sonos product or service that Sonos contends is covered by any of the Patents-in-Suit,  
 10 that is, made, used, sold, offered for sale, and/or imported by Sonos and/or any of its licensees.

11 Sonos further objects to this topic as improper in that it seeks legal opinions and legal  
 12 contentions. Facts that relate to Sonos's entitlement to lost profits and non-infringing alternatives  
 13 call for expert testimony, and a 30(b)(6) deposition is not the appropriate procedure to discovery  
 14 expert opinion evidence or testimony. To the extent that this topic seeks testimony regarding the  
 15 facts that support Sonos's damages claims, Sonos objects to the topic as premature. Expert  
 16 discovery in this case is governed by Court order and separate provisions of the Federal Rules.  
 17 Sonos will provide such opinions in an expert report at the appropriate time under the Court's  
 18 schedule and will make its expert witness available for deposition regarding those topics.

19 For the foregoing reasons, Sonos will not provide a witness on this topic.

20  
 21 Dated: March 22, 2022

ORRICK HERRINGTON & SUTCLIFFE LLP  
 and  
 LEE SULLIVAN SHEA & SMITH LLP

22  
 23 By: /s/ Cole B. Richter

24 Cole B. Richter (admitted *pro hac*)

25  
 26  
 27  
 28 Attorneys for Sonos, Inc.